REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 66-68 and 70-87 are pending in this application, of which claims 66, 84, and 85 are the independent claims. Claims 66, 84, 85 and 87 are amended herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

No new matter is believed to be added herein. The changes to the claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, including, for example, original paragraphs [19], [42], [43], [46], [47] and [70].

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph

Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that the limitation "detection [of the departure] of the user without manual input from the user" of Claim 87 conflicts with the limitation "performed by software configured to use artificial intelligence to examine input or writing style of another user."

Without conceding the correctness of the rejection to claim 87 and in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 87 to recite that "the tasks further comprise receiving information about the user." By way of illustration, but not limiting the scope of the claims, the foregoing task allows the software to compare the input or writing style of another user against the information about the user, and the user can be distinguished from another user. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 87 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 66, 70, 80, 82, 84, and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,244,957 ("Walker") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,145,083 ("Shaffer"). Claims 67, 68, 72-74, 77-79, and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2005/0080915 ("Shoemaker"). Claims 71 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,854,009 ("Hughes"). Claim 75 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,644 ("Hsu"). Claims 83 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,089,508 ("Wright"). Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Walker in view of Shaffer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,219,233 ("Hendriks"). These rejections are respectfully traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The applied references are not understood to disclose or suggest the features of independent claim 66, particularly with respect to at least the features of "*transmitting upon an occurrence of a predetermined event*, from the computing device to the remotely located computing device, a lock session signal for locking a communications session *upon the occurrence of the predetermined event*, the lock session signal configured to restrict access to the communications session until the computing device receives an unlock session signal from the remotely located computing device," as recited in claim 66. (emphasis added)

The Office Action contends that Walker's slot machine 2 corresponds to "a computing device," the slot network server 4 corresponds to "a remotely located computing device," the lock start time corresponds to a "lock session signal" and that "[t]he first player's input is provided much earlier during a logon session used to set up the authentication and the automated game parameters for a game that is scheduled to start later at the time specified by the first player." Office Action, pages 4, 5 and 24.

Even assuming the foregoing contentions were true, which Applicants do not concede, Walker still fails to teach *transmitting* the lock start time from the slot machine 2 to the slot network server 4 *at the lock start time*, for locking the automated play session at the lock start time. At best, Walker's lock start time is transmitted from the slot machine 2 to the slot network server 4 *not* at the time of the lock start time but *much earlier.*

As for Shaffer, it discloses a security module 58 that "may include a timing mechanism that monitors manipulation of the user input devices 44 to detect periods of inactivity" and a screen saver 56 that "switches the computing device 12 to a locked mode when the computing device is idle for a period exceeding the preselected period." Shaffer, col. 5, lines 18-25; FIG. 2. As shown in Shaffer's FIG. 2, all of the devices (i.e., the security module 58, the user input device 44 and the screen saver 56) used to detect inactivity and switch the computing device 12 to a locked mode are located in the computing device 12. Even if inactivity is detected, *no lock session signal is transmitted* from the computing device 12 to a server 38, let alone "*transmitting upon an occurrence of a predetermined event*, from the computing device to the remotely located computing device, a lock session signal for locking a communications session upon the occurrence of the predetermined event," as recited in Applicants' claim 66.

None of the other references is understood to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Walker or Shaffer.

Accordingly, the applied references, either alone or in combination, are not understood to disclose, teach, or suggest the features of independent claim 66, which is believed to be in condition for allowance. Similar arguments from the discussion of independent claim 66 apply to independent claims 84 and 85 as well. In this regard, claims 84 and 85 are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 66, 84 and 85 are respectfully requested.

The other claims currently under consideration in the application are dependent from their respective independent claim 66, 84 or 85 discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least similar reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the dependent claims are respectfully requested.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be other reasons for patentability of any or all claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede, or an actual concession of, any issue with regard to any claim, or any cited art, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions, please call the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502203 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

/Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub/
Soyeon (Karen) Pak Laub, Reg. # 39,266

Please recognize our Customer No. 31824 as our correspondence address.

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 500
Irvine, CA 92612-7108
Phone: 949.851.0633 SKL:kcc
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: June 10, 2010